

### **REMARKS**

Claims 4-7, 10, 14-26 and 54 were pending at the time of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-13, and 27-53 having been previously cancelled. All stand rejected, except for claim 6, which is stated by the Examiner to be allowable if in independent form. This response after final is intended to advance the case to allowance. Claims 4, 6, 21-26 and 54 are cancelled above.

New claim 55 is presented.

#### **Examiner Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks the Examiner for a telephone interview on 7 January 2008, in which the entry of claim 55 and the cancellation of claim 54 were discussed.

#### **Claim amendments**

New independent claim 55 combines the limitations of claims 4 and 6, which is stated as being allowable by the Examiner, after which independent claim 4 and dependent claim 6 are cancelled. Dependent claims 5, 7, 10 and 14 are amended to change their dependency from claim 4 to claim 55.

Claims 21-26, all of which relate to a method of grinding and pumping sewage, are cancelled.

Claim 54 is cancelled.

#### **Claim rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner's prior rejection of independent claim 54 as indefinite because no grinder is claimed is mooted by cancellation of the claim.

#### **Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102**

The Examiner has repeated a rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, and 14 as anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent 6,916,152 B2 to Keener ("Keener '152"). The Examiner has also included a rejection of new claim 54 as anticipated by Keener '152. These rejections are mooted by cancellation of the independent claims 4 and 54.

New independent claim 55 combines the limitations of claims 4 and 6, which is stated as being allowable by the Examiner. Dependent claims 5, 7, 10, and 14-20 now depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 55, and should be allowable as proper dependent claims.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner has repeated rejections of claims 10 and 15-26 as obvious over Keener '152, as the additional claim limitations are obvious design choices once the basic apparatus is known. Applicant respectfully traverses, as the basic apparatus (independent claim 55) is not known and is allowable over the cited prior art.

The rejection of Independent method claim 21, along with its dependent claims 22-26, is mooted by the cancellation of the claims.

Dependent claims 10 and 15-20 are allowable, as stated in the previous section, as proper dependent claims of allowable independent claim 55.

Telephone inquiry to the undersigned in order to clarify or otherwise expedite prosecution of the present application is respectfully encouraged.

Date: 9 January 2008

Respectfully submitted,  
By: /Stephen L Grant, RegNo 33390/  
Stephen L. Grant  
Registration No. 33,390  
Standley Law Group LLP  
495 Metro Place South, Suite 210  
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319  
Telephone: (614) 792-5555  
Facsimile: (614) 792-5536  
[sgrant@standleyllp.com](mailto:sgrant@standleyllp.com)